DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 445 EA 025 827

AUTHOR	Heller, Marjorie F.; Firestone, William A.
TITLE	Heroes, Teams, and Teachers: A Study of Leadership for Change.
PUB DATE	Jan 94
NOTE	46p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; *Change Agents; Educational Innovation; Elementary Education; *Leadership Responsibility; Principals; Problem Solving; *Program Implementation; *Teacher Role; *Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS	Central Office Administrators; *Teacher Leadership

ABSTRACT

Research on leadership for change should focus more on what leaders do and less on who the key leaders are. This study identifies a set of change leadership functions, including providing and selling a vision of change, obtaining resources, providing encouragement and recognition, adapting standard operating procedures, monitoring the improvement effort, and handling disturbances. A study of program implementation in eight schools--four that successfully institutionalized an innovation, three that only institutionalized it in a token form, and one that institutionalized it among a subset of teachers--suggests that these functions do contribute to change and are performed by teams, including the central office, the principal, teachers, and outside consultants. In three of the fully institutionalized schools, the principal served as "head cheerleader," encouraging teachers after observations, during planning meetings, and through a positive demeanor toward the program. Analysis of specific functions showed that teachers contributed to a sustained vision of Social Problem Solving (the innovation), encouraged their peers, and served as informal monitors. However, teachers could not provide programmatic resources and lacked a formal mechanism for contributing to curriculum standardization decisions. There was no critical leader in the change process. Change leadership was a team enterprise, not the work of a single hero. Teachers need further leadership opportunities. (Contains 41 references.) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 371 445

HEROES, TEAMS, AND TEACHERS: A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP FOR CHANGE

Marjorie F. Heller
William A. Firestone

January, 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Firestone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA025827

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Research on leadership for change should focus more on what leaders do and less on who the key leaders are. In that vein, this study identifies a set of change leadership functions, including sustaining a vision for change, encouraging staff, modifying standard operating procedures, and monitoring progress. A study of program implementation in eight schools--four that successfully institutionalized an innovation, three that only institutionalized it in a token form, and one that institutionalized it among a subset of teachers--provides evidence that these functions do contribute to change. It also suggests that these functions are performed by teams, including the central office, the principal, teachers, and outside consultants rather than any single role. Implications for teacher leadership are discussed.

HEROES, TEAMS, AND TEACHERS:
A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP FOR CHANGE

The second wave of educational reform in the late 1980s with its popularization of restructuring raised interest in new roles that give teachers more leadership responsibility (e.g., Elmore, 1990). Such changes as career ladders, teacher mentor programs, and site-based management are all supposed to give teachers increased responsibility for making decisions that affect the collective life of the school and/or coaching and providing feedback to colleagues. Efforts to implement such programs raise some of the classic problems that have concerned reformers since at least the 1950s (Firestone & Corbett, 1988). One of these is the problem of leadership for change. In fact, recent research suggests that the success of teacher leadership "innovations" depends in part on leadership provided by administrators (e.g., Little, 1988). Which administrators provide the most important leadership for change, however seems, to vary from study to study. In this regard recent studies of the implementation of arrangements for teacher leadership replicate some of the ambiguities of earlier research on planned change.

The purpose of this study was to return to the earlier work on program implementation in order to reconsider the sources of leadership for change. Our intent was to address the problem in a new way. Unlike past research that suggested that certain roles were key to change (e.g., Arends, 1982, Berman & McLaughlin, 1978), our thought was that specific leadership functions had to be performed but that who performed them might not be so critical.

In two regards, however, our findings took us farther than we expected to go. First, we were impressed at the extent to which change functions were not performed by individuals or roles but collectively. Second, without intending to, we discovered the importance of teacher leadership for program change even in situations where there was no great interest in promoting such leadership. In subsequent sections, we provide a framework for thinking about leadership for change, describe the program we studied and the methods we used, provide evidence that the change functions analyzed contributed to program institutionalization, and then examine which roles contributed to various functions.

A FRAMEWORK FOR LEADERSHIP FOR CHANGE

In the 1970s and early 1980s, the literature on planned change emphasized the need for strong leadership. Most studies found that the principal was the *key* to change (e.g., Arends, 1982; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Rosenblum & Jastrzab, 1980), but a few gave that role to the superintendent (Rosenblum & Louis, 1981), and some held out for the importance of outside change agents, although more as supports rather than substitutes for internal leadership (Crandall and colleagues, 1982; Keys & Bartunek, 1979; and Schmuck and colleagues, 1977). A very few felt that teacher leadership was important (Carnine, Gersten, & Green, 1982).

Some of these same apparent contradictions have appeared in recent research on new roles for teachers including those that promise more leadership. The principal has been found important for the success of site-based management (Weiss, 1993) and other innovations involving teacher leadership (Little, 1988; Smylie & Denny, 1990). However, one study of a related program, the Coalition for Essential Schools which empowers teachers

in comparison to conventional schools, finds that the superintendent plays a decisive role (Prestine & Brown, 1993). The discussion of how teachers contribute to teacher leadership tends to view them as potential impediments who must be convinced not to resist new role relationships (Little, 1988; Smylie & Denny, 1990). Still, some of the ambiguities of the old research appears in the new; researchers continue to find that some administrator or outside expert plays a critical role in making change happen, but there is no clear consensus about which role is key.

There are numerous possible explanations for these apparently contradictory findings. Contextual factors may play a role. Rosenblum and Louis (1981), for instance, examined district-wide innovations while Berman & McLaughlin (1978) looked at schools. So may methodological factors: the research of Hall and his colleagues (1984) set out to determine how principals contribute to program change. Finally, there may be an attribution problem. Meindl and colleagues (1985) speak of the "romance of leadership," the tendency to ascribe observed results to leadership when other explanations may be more viable. Researchers are not immune to this romance. In part to provide alternative conceptions, Kerr and Jermier (1978) and Pitner (1986) have identified substitutes for leadership that can contribute to organizational functioning when leadership is not present and impediments that keep leadership from contributing to organizational performance.

Somewhat in the Kerr-Jermier-Pitner tradition, this research sought to reconceptualize leadership for change. Our thought was that successful change results not from the work of a key leader but from the effective performance of a series of change leadership functions. This line of reasoning suggests that certain tasks need to be accomplished, but it does not

matter who does them. The analytic focus then is on identifying important functions, not the right roles. Similar work has been done by Louis and Miles (1990).

In previous work, Firestone (1989; Firestone & Corbett, 1988) identified six leadership functions. The first is *providing and selling a vision* of the change. A central leadership task is clarifying organizational goals and ensuring that participants are oriented towards meeting those goals (Schlechty, 1985; Selznick, 1957). If the innovation adopted fits with broader organizational goals, the subsequent implementation effort is more likely to be successful because people will understand why they are doing what they are doing (Fullan, 1991). Vision must be provided in both conceptual and operational terms. Those who have examined change as learning process have shown that teachers must know not only what procedures they are expected to follow but also what the broader purposes are (Hall & Loucks, 1977; Huberman & Miles, 1984). That way they understand when and in what ways it is appropriate to take initiative. When only a broad vision is provided without details as to what is expected in practice, teachers flounder (van der Vegt & Knip, 1988). As a result, providing a vision entails specifying the major purposes of a reform, showing their links to broader goals, clarifying the procedures individuals are expected to follow, and specifying outcome targets.

The second function is *obtaining resources*. These include time, personnel, funds, materials and facilities. Depending on the nature of the reform, time may be the most important resource for developing and learning new procedures or activities (Corbett, Dawson & Firestone, 1984). Huberman and Miles (1984) show that teachers often take eighteen months or more to be able to use new procedures comfortably. In such cases, early

evaluation may lead to inappropriately discouraging conclusions. Materials are also important both as a reward to those participating in the project and as necessary facilitators to allow people to do whatever is required (Firestone, 1980). Imagine, for instance, a teacher trying to teach a whole language curriculum without appropriate books to read.

While there is a tendency to define resources in concrete terms, knowledge and ideas also become key to using reform. Administrators spend an important part of their time canvassing their colleagues and accessible experts for ideas on what constitutes acceptable compliance with regulations, what people in other schools are doing, and what more developed "innovations" are available to respond to fads and mandates (Firestone, Rossman, & Wilson, 1982). An important part of the implementation process is creating the learning opportunities for lower level staff so they can engage in the activities expected of them (Huberman & Miles, 1984). For that reason, staff development is also a crucial resource.

A third function is *providing encouragement and recognition.* The kinds of change required when using reform often entail special costs for teachers, principals, and supervisors in the form of extra effort, increased uncertainty, stress, and deviation from preferred goals. Special incentives are required to overcome these costs (Sieber, 1981). Social support and encouragement are important incentives that are relatively easy to provide during the change process. A great deal can be provided through special attention from influential individuals, especially principals, superintendents, and those in visible, high status roles (Corbett et al., 1984; Mintzberg, 1973). Providing recognition requires finesse because individuals want to stand out from the crowd while being part of a winning team (Peters & Waterman, 1982). For that reason, informal acknowledgement is sometimes more effective than more formal

systems. Nevertheless, there may be room for both.

Adapting standard operating procedures is a fourth function. Standard operating procedures include a whole array of formal arrangements such as course sequences, textbooks, standardized tests, staff and student evaluation procedures, rules governing staff and student building assignments, lesson plans, and so forth. Sometimes these procedures can be major barriers to new policies. For instance, Gross and colleagues (1971) found that open classrooms and other procedures that encourage teamwork and intrinsic rewards, like cooperative learning, may be incompatible with report cards emphasizing letter grades and with student tracking. Similarly, new standardized curricula and pacing schedules that ensure that all students move through the content at the same rate to be familiar with material on state-mandated tests are incompatible with instructional approaches that emphasize developing individual capacities at the student's pace (Madaus, 1988). The incompatibility of new and old practices often seems predictable in retrospect, but it may not become apparent until the new approaches move out of the pilot stage and are implemented more broadly (Yin, Quick, Bateman, & Marks, 1978). For new practices to become a regular part of the system, it is necessary not only to change old standard operating procedures but also to change the rules to reflect the new, build them into the budget, and develop routines to orient newcomers appropriately (Huberman & Miles, 1984).

A fifth function is *monitoring the improvement effort*. It has become a management truism that "you get what you measure." This is one of the implications of experience with management by objectives (Hampton, Sumner, & Webber, 1978). It is also true of the effective schools research that found that student learning become more important when the

principal spent more time examining and discussing student tests (Purkey & Smith, 1985). It is also important, however, to monitor process, especially with change efforts. Mintzberg (1973) portrays chief executives as open to a wide variety of information--wider than is available through any formal monitoring or indicator system--including internal operations, external events, analyses, ideas and trends, and pressures. Such information is useful not only for ensuring that the reform is on track, but also for anticipating new opportunities and problems. This wide array of information used by managers to monitor their organizations also suggests that it is difficult to monitor systematically. Less formalizable approaches like "managing by wandering around" (Peters & Waterman, 1982) are important for monitoring.

The final function is *handling disturbances* (Mintzberg, 1973) that come from outside and in. An important part of handling disturbances is buffering the innovation from outside interference. Paradoxically, change requires a great deal of stability (Prestine & Bowen, 1993). Commitment and understanding require a great deal of time to develop as lower participants learn about new demands made on them (Fullan, 1985). Such participants can quickly become confused and overloaded if too many changes take place at once. This may create the unusual situation of a district or school actively embracing one innovation while just as actively opposing another for fear that simultaneous implementation will overtax the system. Sometimes, however, buffering may not be enough. Occasionally, active change in external forces may be necessary, especially when state mandates prove harmful in a particular situation. Then it may be necessary to go beyond protecting people from requirements to assertively seeking a waiver from it.

Internal disturbances must also be handled. The ambiguity of the change process ensures that implementation will always entail some surprises (Fullan, 1991). Some part of the change will be more difficult to implement than expected; needed materials will not arrive on time; groups will start fighting over some aspect of the plan. To maintain an even flow in the implementation process it will be necessary for key individuals to drop what they are doing and deal with the unexpected situation.

These six functions should represent the bulk of tasks that must be accomplished to sustain a change process. The question that such a list raises is who performs them. The possible roles include the superintendent and other central office line officials, outside trainers or change agents associated with the program being implemented, principals, and even teachers. Firestone and Corbett (1988) speculated that functions like providing resources and adapting standard operating procedures that require formal authority can only be accomplished by line officials--superintendents and principals. Presumably other functions can be fulfilled by a variety of roles. For instance, teachers are well placed to provide colleagues with encouragement and informal recognition. This is much more difficult for central administrators to do by reason of distance. However, such encouragement or moral support may count for more just because it is so rare: hence, the symbolic impact of the superintendent attending a training session with teachers (Corbett et al., 1984).

To explore the utility of these change functions and how they are performed, we studied the institutionalization of one specific program in eight schools.

THE PROGRAM AND THE STUDY

The study focused on the institutionalization of Social Problem Solving (SPS) which is much more like the introduction of a discrete program or curriculum than the broad restructuring reforms intended to enhance teacher leadership. SPS is designed to help elementary children apply critical thinking and problem solving skills to interpersonal situations with the intent of reducing problems of substance abuse, delinquency, the spread of AIDS, and in-school disorder (Elias & Clabby, 1989). The program is applicable to children in both regular and special education. Its more proximate objectives are to help children calm down, develop understandings of social problem situations and people in them, consider alternative actions and their consequences, and plan detailed strategies for reaching their goals. The skills are taught as more academic subjects are taught through a series of engaging lessons with multiple practice opportunities and homework assignments.

After initial discussions with program staff, a district interested in initiating SPS will identify a coordinator who selects teachers to participate--the program can begin in one grade level or among special education teachers and may or may not spread from there within a school--and helps set up a system of training and consultation between those teachers and SPS staff. In later years, SPS has recommended the formation of an SPS committee in each school consisting of teachers who teach the program, the building administrator, and other key resource staff like guidance counselors and child study team members. After a plan for piloting the program is developed, two to three days of training is provided to all staff. The committee receives another day of training on program management. Part of the service the district purchases is sets of coordinated, scripted lesson materials and follow through

activities. After initial piloting, SPS staff continue to provide follow up assistance and ongoing technical support. The team is responsible for administering selected measures to monitor program implementation, student gains, and overall program effectiveness.

The remainder of this section describes the sample of schools chosen, data collection within the schools, and analysis procedures.

SCHOOL SAMPLE

The research team worked with the SPS organization to identify nine schools that had been using the program for at least three years. The intent was to identify equal numbers of schools that varied in their success in institutionalizing the program.[1] After data collection, one school was eliminated from the study because internal sample selection criteria were not met, and it became apparent that a new principal was trying to make it appear more successful than it had been. The remaining eight schools were divided into three groups based on SPS nomination checked by field work on the sight. Four schools had fully institutionalized the program--that is, all teachers who were supposed to be using the program were doing so according to the SPS consultant, and a combination of SPS report and our interviewing indicated that the program was being used with a high degree of fidelity. Three had institutionalized it in a token manner; the schools continued to be affiliated with the SPS program, and there were some indications that teachers went through the motions, but use was limited and the quality was poor. The final school was classified as a mixed case in that teachers who had been in the program for a long time were at best partial users, but a new principal had started over with a subset of teachers who were much

more supportive and effective in using SPS.

Table 1 presents information on the schools studied. Although the exact grade spans varied, all were elementary schools. All but one were suburban schools of at least moderate wealth with relatively low minority populations. The exception was one of the schools that had fully institutionalized the program.

TABLE 1 GOES HERE

WITHIN SCHOOL DATA COLLECTION

Because we began with a fairly explicit question about planned change an highly structured open-ended interview guide was employed.[2] The instrument probed three areas. First, questions verified staff's assessment of the success of institutionalization in the school by asking about respondents' behavior and knowledge and sentiments about SPS. The second asked about leadership functions for change. Finally, respondents were asked to evaluate the contribution that major roles in the school made to performing these functions. In this manner, informants working in various roles in the school provided perspectives on both their own contribution and those of others, allowing for some cross-role triangulation. The guide was pre-tested twice with SPS teachers and principals in other schools to ensure that the language was clear and meaningful to respondents (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Within each school, interviews were conducted with the principal and three teachers, usually selected by the principal. In three of the four districts, another interview was conducted with a district "gatekeeper" identified by the SPS consultant for that district.

These were an assistant superintendent, a substance abuse coordinator, and a middle school principal. In the fourth district, the principal interviewed in one school was also the district gatekeeper. The SPS consultants for the districts were also interviewed about the schools they monitored. We returned to these consultants periodically when questions arose during data collection and analysis.

We conducted 42 interviews over four months. Teacher interviews took between 35 and 40 minutes during a teacher preparation period or specially arranged release time. Other interviews were generally longer as more time was available.

ANALYSIS STRATEGY

The strategy for analysis was driven by the research issues. First, the level of institutionalization of each school was verified. Second, an explanation for the degree of institutionalization was sought focusing on the change leadership functions. Finally, the roles contributing to these functions were analyzed (where they were performed). At each step of the way triangulation across roles was emphasized to ensure that an accurate picture emerged. For instance, principals tended to inflate the extent to which functions were performed in their schools and they contributed to those functions. However, their reports were checked against those of teachers. As the within school analysis proceeded, cross-site matrices were developed to show pattern of function and role performance within schools (Huberman & Miles, 1984).

FINDINGS

The following pages describe what the SPS program looked like in fully and partially institutionalized schools, what functions were performed and how they contributed to institutionalization, what roles contributed to function performance, and how those roles were configured.

SPS INSTITUTIONALIZED

Initial ratings of success in institutionalization were made by the SPS consultants, but these ratings were checked through on-site interviews which led to the creation of the mixed category. This category fit one school that the SPS consultants viewed as not really implementing the program. However, interviews revealed that a new principal had decided to focus on the few teachers who supported the program. Those teachers were using the program correctly while most teachers objected to it and refused to cooperate. Schools where the program was fully institutionalized differed from those where institutionalization was only token with regard to teachers' understanding of the program, their classroom practice, and student behavior (as reported by teachers). Teachers and administrators in the fully institutionalized schools understood and supported the program's purpose. They said, "Everyone [in this school] sees the value of having these coping skills starting young" while those where implementation was more token said "Educators get on a bandwagon with a program like SPS. Then it all dies." or "Teachers feel SPS is too personal, delving into children's lives."

The program has a specific scope and sequence for teachers to follow as well as its own language used by both instructors and students with terms like "speaker power,"

"listening position," "be your BEST," and "sharing circle." Teachers in fully institutionalized schools followed the scope and sequence and used this language when describing the program. As one said, "[SPS] works beautifully. Keep Calm, Be your BEST, Speaker Power. Children respond so readily." In the token schools, teachers said "I think the teachers all do it in a different way. Some don't have time." or "I don't spend a lot of time planning, never write SPS objectives in my planbook. I don't really need anything. Actually, you just do your own thing."

Finally, since SPS is supposed to modify behavior outside the lesson itself, students should carry over what they learn in the specific lessons to other settings. Teachers and administrators report that this happens in the fully institutionalized schools. One principal said, "I don't see as many students in my office; behavioral problems in this school were cut in half." A teacher observed changes "right off the bat. The very first year you would see the kids calming themselves. They accepted the techniques and enjoyed them." Such changes were not noted in the token schools.

In the mixed case school, one subset of teachers understood and supported the program, used it, and saw positive results; but the rest of the teachers did not.

LEADERSHIP FUNCTIONS

The first analytic task was to see which leadership functions were present in the fully institutionalized schools but not in the token schools (Table 2). A function was identified as fulfilled if three of the five people interviewed said it was. Some administrators, especially in the token schools, would say a function was addressed when no teacher would. SPS staff were used to reconcile conflicting reports from schools.

Table 2 goes here

Providing and Selling a Vision

Early in SPS' history in a district, the program was usually sold in some similar way in all schools. Because the program was often implemented with a particular group of teachers at first, this initial sell was usually targeted. Still, most teachers who had been initial implementers (10 of 12 in the fully institutionalized schools; 12 of 14 in the three token schools) recalled being introduced to SPS' benefits by a program advocate.

What differentiated the fully implemented schools from the others was that in the former the vision was maintained. One teacher at Baker told how SPS was initiated as a response to a need for behavior control with some at-risk children and then opened further when "good changes" occurred. She said it was fully implemented in the grades and would be expanded to after-school groups in the future. All three Collins teachers described both an initial and a continuing vision in both the school and the district. One said, "Five years from now, you will still see SPS in all the grades in this school with all the children, fully integrated." When asked about the future, a Davis teacher said, "It will be here, perhaps with more at-risk groups, more peer coaching, and more sharing among colleagues." In the token schools, responses were more tentative. Teachers said "Now that its here, I would only hope that we remain committed" and "I have no knowledge of the long-range plan; the principal knows, no one else."

The pattern at Hollis, the mixed school was quite different from the token schools. All three teachers plus the principal described both the initial selling of the program and a sustained vision. Moreover, all were very positive about it. The consultant assigned to the school later explained that these teachers carried the program as a departmentalized subject in the grade levels they taught because other teachers in the building had openly rebelled against it. Moreover, the current principal was much more committed to the program than his predecessor.

Obtaining Resources

The costs to SPS turned out to be modest. Districts began by training staff which usually required three consecutive days although this was sometimes cut to two. There is also the cost of follow-up training and trouble shooting provided regularly by the SPS consultant. Finally, the necessary materials and supplies were minimal. One curriculum binder contains the entire program, and there are no consumable materials. Even this cost was reduced in one building where teachers were forced to share binders. It also helps for teachers who use the program to have a common planning time.

There was not a marked difference among schools with regard to availability of resources. Most teachers in all schools said they had the resources they needed to implement the program. When pressed, a few suggested that they needed more joint planning time to share ideas about the program. Administrators generally agreed about the present. However, those in the token schools worried about the future. As one said, "you will need additional workshops if you have a turnover of staff." Those where the school was fully institutionalized were more positive about getting the same funding. According to one, "all

we need is training for new teachers. Everything is easy."

Providing Encouragement and Recognition

Few teachers in the fully institutionalized schools reported receiving formal recognition, but most got it informally. If teachers were personally asked to participate in SPS, they interpreted the invitation as recognition that they were strong, highly regarded staff members. They interpreted positive feedback after observations as encouragement. In the token schools, questions about encouragement and recognition usually drew blank looks. Although some principals in these schools said they provided encouragement, teachers disagreed. In one school the principal said, "We have to encourage teachers. Encouragement and commitment: the principal is the key. I talk a lot about [SPS]." However, one of his teachers said, "I don't feel Mr. ___ has a particular stake in [SPS]." In the mixed school teachers and the principal agreed that the principal verbally supported teachers' efforts; however, this support was limited to the cadre of teachers who were actually using the program.

Adapting Standard Operating Procedures

Starting a new program requires that time be found to fit it in (Corbett et al., 1984). With SPS standard operating procedures were adjusted to make this time by building it into the formal curriculum and related evaluation procedures. According to one teacher, "the need to standardize the program and make it part of the curriculum is critical in keeping it viable. Otherwise, you're doing something no one else really expects you to do."

Teachers in three of the fully institutionalized schools described where SPS fit in their curriculum and how often they taught it. As one said, "I set aside thirty minutes once a week; we put it in our planbooks." These three schools incorporated SPS into their health curriculum; two combined SPS with a substance abuse program. The one exception among the fully institutionalized schools was Collins where teachers scheduled SPS into different subjects, including social studies and current events, for different time periods. In the mixed school, SPS was standardized by being departmentalized. It was taught as a separate curriculum on a grade level by a designated teacher for one marking period each year.

In the token schools, standardized procedures had not been clearly defined. In two schools, the central administration had written SPS into the curriculum and specified the amount of time it should be taught. However, this decision had not been effectively communicated by the principals so none of the teachers in those schools had any idea as to how to integrate SPS into their teaching. In one of these schools, a teacher said, if they want it to be part of the curriculum, it must be standardized and integrated. Otherwise its going to fall the way of all the new programs introduced: by the wayside." In the third token school, one teacher said the program was in the curriculum guide for health, but another said she "forced herself into incorporating SPS into English lessons."

Monitoring the Change

In all four fully institutionalized schools, teachers reported that someone observed their teaching of SPS, checked to see that it was in plan books, and asked questions about their progress and problems. In the token schools, teachers just said that monitoring was "not done" or was only done by the SPS consultant who had no authority to follow up if the

teacher was not performing adequately. In the mixed school, teachers using the program agreed with the principal that that person did monitor their SPS teaching.

Handling Disturbances

This function overlapped with those already discussed. In all schools teachers worried about the time crunch created by competing programs. They all agreed that, "Its one more to squeeze in; there's a time factor" and that "we need a longer school day." What differentiated these schools was that in the fully institutionalized ones, the disturbance created by competing curricular priorities had been resolved through a combination of a sustained vision for SPS, standard operating procedures that gave it a clear place, monitoring to ascertain that time was allocated to the program, and encouraging teachers to continue their efforts to implement SPS fully. Where these functions were not well performed, primarily in the token schools, disturbances erupted that threatened SPS' viability.

ROLES AND FUNCTIONS

The fully institutionalized schools share the following characteristics that differentiate them from the schools with token institutionalization: a sustained vision of SPS, continuing encouragement and recognition for teachers using the program, standardized procedures that build the program into the curriculum (with the exception of one fully institutionalized school), and continuing monitoring of the program. All schools had sufficient resources. Only the fully institutionalized schools handle disturbances, but in fact this function appears redundant with several others.

So far, however, we have not spoken to our original question of whether there is a critical role for institutionalizing change, and if so whether it is the principal or some other position. To address that question, we examine each separate role. The focus of attention is the fully institutionalized schools. This analysis suggests that the contribution of high profile administrative roles, although important, is less than might be expected while that of teachers is larger. What is really striking, however, is the redundancy with which functions are fulfilled (Table 3).

Table 3 goes here

Central Administration

By virtue of their access to external networks, superintendents and assistant superintendents are often initiators of changes (Carlson, 1972). They also have the formal authority to control the purse strings and the formal curriculum. Thus, one might expect the central administration to play a major role with three classic central office functions: providing a vision and resources and standardizing operating procedures. These expectations were not uniformly met.

Although one tends to think of the central office as line administrators--the superintendent and assistant superintendent--in small districts central office assignments are often assigned to others. Thus, in the district Baker and Davis were in, the middle school principal oversaw SPS in all participating schools. This principal had been the initial champion for the program when he was principal at Baker. He negotiated the initial

implementation in a few special education classes and oversaw its later spread. In Collins' district, a substance abuse coordinator had been the original program champion and continued to oversee it with some help from regular line officials.

The central office contributed substantially to the initial vision for change in seven of the eight schools; it sold the program to those schools. Someone above the school level, continued to sell the vision in all fully institutionalized schools, but that work was only done by line officials in Adams' district. In Baker and Davis the vision actually came from the middle school principal. Through the force of his personal enthusiasm and commitment, he kept SPS on the "front burner" for many years. However, even in these schools, he was not the only source of this sustaining vision. In Collins, while regular district administrators showed little interest in the program, the substance abuse coordinator continued to sell the vision of the program for five years after its had started.

The central office provided financial resources in seven of the eight schools through contributions from the district's operating budget for on-going training and additional materials. The only district that did not support SPS out of its regular budget was Collins where the substance abuse coordinator was instrumental in obtaining grants for the program.

The central office also helped to standardize SPS in the curriculum in all fully institutionalized schools except Collins. Still, as indicated by the token schools described above where SPS was formally in the curriculum, but that fact was not known by teachers, central office standardization is not enough. In all three fully institutionalized schools that standardized the program, either the teachers or the principal or all three also contributed in this area. The absence of standardization in Collins shows the importance of having line

officials involved with a program. The substance abuse coordinator who was the true program advocate in that district lacked the authority to build SPS into the curriculum.

In addition to these expected contributions, the middle school principal who advocated SPS in Baker and Davis provided continuing encouragement. Teachers reported that although he had left Baker school, he continued to provide positive feedback to them. In Collins, central office encouragement came from the substance abuse coordinator who was very enthusiastic about the program and described his style as "uninhibited." His solid working relationship with the principal and external consultant as well as his informal credibility enabled him to publicly recognize teachers' and students' involvement in the program even though doing so was outside his normal authority.

For the most part, the central office was not involved in either on-going program monitoring or handling disturbance. However, the Collins substance abuse coordinator contributed in both areas by meeting regularly with the external consultant to discuss the program and keep track of which new teachers needed to be trained and to receive materials. He also made sure that SPS continued to be a priority.

The Principal

The research reviewed above suggests that the principal is most likely to be the "hero" of the change process. As visionaries close to the action, they are well placed to sell a vision to teachers. When developing school budgets, they can provide resources. Because they are in the building, they can become cheerleaders for a program in a way that is difficult from the central office, and they can monitor day-to-day program use.

The principals in the fully institutionalized schools generally did not live up to the

high expectations created by past research. Only two helped sustain the SPS vision. Baker's principal was viewed as generally supporting SPS while Collins' principal was the only one seen as a strong visionary. Davis' principal was new to the building and had not yet had enough time to become familiar with all programs there. In Adams, the principal did not support the program. In the words of the SPS consultant. This principal "doesn't harm SPS," he just "allows it to happen." In fact, he was not identified as contributing to any leadership functions.

Since funding for the program generally came from the central office, most principals did not have to get more. The Collins principal, however, had to help the substance abuse counselor secure external grants because the central office did not support the program. The Baker and Davis principals did not provide financial support, but they did provide common time for SPS teachers to meet and got substitutes so they could be trained.

In three of the four fully institutionalized schools, the principal served as "head cheerleader," encouraging teachers after observations, during planning meetings, and through a generally positive demeanor towards the program. The Hollis principal was also extremely encouraging of teachers willing to try the program in that mixed school. In no case, however, was the principal the sole source of encouragement; and Adams' principal did not encourage teachers at all.

In Baker and Davis, the principals reinforced standard operating procedures, partly by communicating them, but also contributing to periodic reviews to make sure that those procedures continued to be appropriate.

The Baker, Collins, and Davis principals also monitored SPS to varying extents by checking lesson plans, observing lessons formally or informally, discussing strengths and weaknesses of the classroom use of the program, and providing advice. As a newcomer not yet fully versed in the program, the Davis principal probably did this the least. A teacher at Collins said that the principal "observes [SPS] very frequently; she's fully aware and our greatest supporter." By contrast, the Adams principal said he "didn't get involved" in monitoring SPS. It should be noted, however, that the principal was never the only person monitoring SPS.

For the most part, principals helped handle disturbances through their contribution to other functions. Only the Collins principal was cited by others as making sure that competing programs did not push SPS out.

Finally, the principal in the mixed school contributed to most functions but only for the core group using the program. His unique contribution to standardizing procedures was to departmentalize it and assign responsibility to interested teachers. This structural arrangement protected the program from teachers who opposed it and allowed teachers who supported it to use it with a large number of students.

Teachers

Teachers are generally viewed as lacking the formal authority to control resources or standardize procedures. Conceivably they could interact with peers in ways that help sustain a vision, provide encouragement, and contribute informal monitoring. However, research emphasizing the isolation of individual teachers and norms of privacy that limit discussion of curriculum and instruction discourage expectations that their contributions in this area will be

large (Little, 1990). In fact this isolation is just what many restructuring proposals are intended to overcome.

Thus, one of the major surprises of this research was the extent to which teachers contributed to a variety of functions. In fact in Adams School, teachers carried the program. The program started in that district because a principal in another school and a district administrator became interested in it. The district chose to initiate a comprehensive training program for all schools in this rather large district which enabled a team of Adams teachers to get initial orientation. The central office also formally built the program into the district health curriculum. However, it did not monitor day-to-day events, and the principal showed little interest in the program. According to the SPS consultant, what kept the program going at Adams was "a critical mass" of teachers. Convinced of the intrinsic worth of the program, they continued to sell the SPS vision to their colleagues and provide each other with informal encouragement. In this they are helped by the SPS consultant. The teachers believe the program would work better if administrators would adjust the formal curriculum because they do not see SPS fitting in well. They would also like additional workshops to update their training and opportunities to discuss what they are doing, but this critical mass is able to maintain the program without a great deal of outside support.

The analysis of specific functions show that teachers contributed to a sustained vision for SPS in all fully institutionalized schools. They understood the value of SPS, the needs it addressed, and its curricular goals. They were strongly committed to the program and sold on its results, describing positive changes in student behavior (see above). Most important, they continued to sell this vision by reinforcing each others' efforts, encouraging each other,

and initiating newcomers into the program. They also provided informal encouragement to peers by sharing classroom experiences with SPS. These discussions provided feedback and advice on how to deal with problems as well as ideas about teaching strategies and lesson plans. Teachers cited colleagues as among those they would most often turn to for help with SPS. These informal discussions not only provided encouragement, but also served as a sort of informal monitoring to ensure that teachers used the program.

On the other hand, teachers never provided programmatic resources. They simply lacked control over money, time and personnel. Similarly, they often lacked a formal mechanism to contribute to the decisions that standardized the curriculum. Baker and Davis teachers did have such a mechanism that will be discussed below.

External Consultants

The external consultants are employed by SPS to train school personnel. After initial training, SPS assigned one consultant to each school to become familiar with its staff and climate. The consultant then followed an annual schedule of classroom visitations and discussions with teachers and the principal to keep the program on track.

The functions these individuals performed depended on a mix of SPS strategy, formal authority, and access to the schools. It was part of SPS' strategy to have the consultants help sell the initial vision to the district and schools through initial discussions, orientations, and formal training sessions. After the initial sell, however, the consultants did not try to sustain the vision. Instead, they focussed on more concrete decisions about where to introduce the program and how to expand it and improve instruction. This change of focus from vision to tactical issue appears to have been an oversight rather than a conscious decision.[3]

Like teachers and to some extent principals, external consultants lacked the authority to allocate resources or standardize SPS procedures by making formal curricular decisions.

The function where the role of the consultant differed most between the fully institutionalized and the token schools was monitoring. The consultant was the strongest monitor in the fully institutionalized schools because teachers could count on this person to visit, observe, and provide feedback on their use of SPS in the classroom. (S)he was recognized as a person with experience and knowledge who was used to solve problems, brainstorm new strategies, and model lessons. The consultant also gave feedback to principals and others on the status of the program as well as advice on how to improve it.

Although consultants engaged in similar activities in the token schools, the results were not the same because of lack of principal support. Teachers believed they could ignore the consultant because the principal did not support that person. Phrases like "we can invite her in" and "some teachers don't use her at all" signalled this lack of support.

Consultants also provided support and handled disturbances in the fully institutionalized schools. This was done as part of the consultant's regular contact with teachers which provided the opportunity to encourage them. Again, the consultant engaged in the same activity in other schools, but the effects of this encouragement were undermined by lack of principal support.

CONFIGURATIONS OF FUNCTION FULFILLMENT

As expected, the role-by-role analysis challenged the centrality of both the principal and district leadership to change leadership. However, it also suggested that there was more complexity in the relationships among roles than had originally been expected. To organize

this complexity, we considered past literature and our own data to identify four relatively holistic patterns for change leadership: the hero, the gatekeeper, the division of labor, and the team.

The hero pattern is most frequently discussed in past research. It is implicit in all the analyses suggesting that one role is key or central or crucial to the change process. This pattern has been criticized by Corbett & D'Amico (1986) who suggest that if one waits for a hero change will never happen in some places. At a minimum, the hero is an internal idea champion (Daft & Becker, 1978) who finds out about a program and sells it internally. There was certainly evidence of internal advocacy, especially by the middle school principal in the Baker-Davis district and the substance abuse counselor at Collins. However, when applied to change leadership functions, the hero pattern suggests that one role fulfills all or most of them alone. The closest administrator to that pattern may have been the current Baker principal who fulfilled all the functions except handling disturbances, but this person was supported substantially by the central administration, teachers, and the external agent. An even closer approximation was the teachers at Adams who maintained SPS in their school in spite of the principal's lack of interest and only formal support--financing and standardization in the curriculum--from the central office. Even in Collins the most striking observation was not the heroic struggles of one role so much as the way that role was backstopped by support from other places.

The term gatekeeper is often used in informal analyses of planned change to identify those who determine whether a program is allowed to enter or not. The gatekeeper may not fulfill any functions personally but can keep others from doing so or otherwise stop program

implementation. While we did not see any of this negative gatekeeper behavior--principals were apathetic, but not actively opposed to the program--Rollow and Bryk (1993) provide a nice description of it. In their school, the principal provided modest encouragement for a university effort to help teachers improve their language arts teaching until she read an evaluation that she construed as critical of her. At that point, she signaled her displeasure with the program in such ways that all teachers who were loyal to her--virtually all teachers in the building--refused to participate in the program.

There are two alternatives to the hero pattern. The first is the division of labor where each function is centralized in one role but different roles perform different functions. Strict division of labor was never observed. In 22 out of 24 instances where a function was performed in a fully institutionalized school, it was performed by two or more roles. The exceptions were both in Adams school.

What seemed to be more typical was the team pattern where functions were redundantly performed. The image of a team may overstate the extent of interaction among members in the process of fulfilling functions. We never saw the tightly choreographed performances that one finds on a football team where plays are scripted in advance and the success of each individual depends on that of the other. The closest approximation to this came in the standardization area where district decisions about where SPS would fit in the curriculum were only effective when communicated by the principal and monitored by both the principal and the consultant. One tends to think more of a basketball team where there is often a higher level of joint improvisation. That seemed to occur with encouragement where individuals made decisions to reinforce others based on observed performance rather than any

tight definition of role responsibility. Even here, however, the idea of interdependence implied by good team basketball exceeds what we observed. What was striking was that people in very different roles fulfilled the same function, sometimes collaboratively, but often redundantly.

One formal arrangement contributed to team performances. This was the creation of SPS resource committees in Baker and Davis schools. These committees consisted of a central office representative, the principal, and teachers participating in the program. These committees put the middle school principal and other central administrators in closer contact with program operations. It allowed them to help reinforce the SPS vision in those schools and through more regular contact to encourage and recognize efforts related to the program. At the same time, because these committees were charged with evaluating the programs in their schools, principals in particular had input into district curriculum decisions that standardized the program. Moreover, these committees created the expectation that their planning work would allow the principal and teachers input into future resource allocation decisions. Thus, SPS resource committees appeared to offer the promise of more collective management for the program and to increase coordination among the various roles.

CONCLUSION

There are a number of limitations to this study. First, unlike most change research which focus on implementation, this one examined institutionalization. This decision helps identify the degree of success of the change process. Trying to predict ultimate success of a change at adoption or during implementation is notoriously difficult. On the other hand, we have lost the dynamics of the implementation process itself which is especially strenuous and

perplexing for those going through it. The contributions of various roles and functions may be different during that stage and later on.

The second limitation is that this is a study of a single innovation. Although SPS deals with interpersonal behavior and is useful for preventing drug use and misbehavior, it is more like a conventional curriculum than restructuring innovations like the Coalition for Essential Schools or programs to bring about teacher leadership or site-based management. It is hard to know how these findings will generalize to different curricular areas or, more to the point, to structural changes.

Still, the study illustrates the utility of shifting focus when studying change leadership from a search for key roles to an analysis of the functions that support the processes of implementation and institutionalization. When comparing schools that had institutionalized a program with those that had not, we found a subset of functions performed in the first, but not in the second. These include providing a sustained vision of the change, offering encouragement, and monitoring its progress. These especially useful to institutionalizing at least this program. Providing essential resources also appears helpful although sufficient resources were also found in the schools that only established the program in a token form. Adjusting standard operating procedures is another important function although one school managed to sustain the program without such procedures Finally, handling disturbances does not appear to be an activity that is distinct from the others.

What is striking in light of most past research is that we did not find a critical leader of the change process. In contrast to earlier studies, the principal certainly did not stand out as key to the process. What was most intriguing was the redundancy with which functions

were fulfilled which suggests that change leadership is more of a team enterprise than the work of a single hero.

Another important observation concerns the contribution of teachers to the change process. In this study, teachers were not passive subordinates who either took orders from above or resisted change as they are sometimes portrayed in the literature. Where SPS was institutionalized, they actively helped to sustaining the program vision, monitor progress and provide encouragement. Indeed, in one school they carried the program in spite of a lack of interest among those with greater formal authority. This teacher leadership was not the heroic redefinition of a school's mission nor the wielding of power and influence. While more prosaic it exemplified the mutual teaching and mutual support described by Johnson (1990), Little (1982), Rosenholtz (1989) and others which provides the argument for structural changes to promote teacher leadership.

These observations suggest two broader implications for the study of teacher leadership. First, it reminds us that, however unlikely, teacher leadership is possible in schools as they are currently structured and that it can complement that coming from other sources. Second, it suggests that when planning structural changes to promote teacher leadership, teachers should be considered as more than a possible source of resistance. Restructuring to make teachers leaders--like other kinds of change--is likely to benefit from leadership from many sources, including teachers themselves.

END NOTES

1. It is conventional to divide the change process into three stages, usually referred to as initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. This last stage takes place when a program that has been implemented successfully is made a regular, permanent part of the school in question and seeks to be a new, or special part of that school (Fullan, 1991). Focusing on this latter stage does not allow the researchers to document the change process itself, but is does ensure that cases compared are properly classified--that is, one is sure which ones are using the program and which ones are not.

2. See Patton (1990) for a review of different levels of structure possible when interviewing.

3. Personal communication with Maurice Elias, one of the founders of SPS.

REFERENCES

Arends, R. I. (1982). The meaning of administrative support. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 4, 79-82.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII, Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Carlson, R. O. (1972). School superintendents: Careers and performance. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Carnine, D., Gersten, R., & Green, S. (1982). The principal as instructional leader: A second look. Educational Leadership, 40, 3, 47-50.

Corbett, H. D. & D'Amico, J. J. (1986). No more heroes: Creating systems to support change. Educational Leadership, 44, 70-72.

Corbett, H., Dawson, J., & Firestone, W. A. (1984). School context and school change: Implications for effective planning. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Crandall, D. P. & colleagues (1982). People, policies and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement. Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc.

Daft, R. L. & Becker, S. W. (1978). The innovative organization. New York: Elsevier.

Elias, M. J. & Clabby, J. F. (1989). Building social problem solving skills: Guidelines from a school-based program. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elmore, R. E. (1990). Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Firestone, W. A. (1989). Using reform: Conceptualizing district initiative. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11, 2, 151-165.

Firestone, W. A. (1980). Great expectations for small schools: The limitations of federal projects. New York: Praeger.

Firestone, W. A. & Corbett, H. D. (1988). Organizational Change. In N. Boyan (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Educational Administration, 321-41. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing.

Firestone, W. A., Rossman, G. B. & Wilson, B. L. (1982). Only a Phone Call Away: Local Educators' Views of Regional Education Service Agencies. Research for Better Schools, 1982.

Fullan, M. (1991) The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. G. (1985). Change processes and strategies at the local level. The Elementary School Journal, 85, 3, 391-421.

Goetz, J. P. & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. B., & Bernstein, M. (1971). Implementing organizational innovations: A sociological analysis of planned educational change. New York: Basic Books.

Hall, G. & Loucks, S. (1977). A developmental model for determining whether the treatment is actually implemented. American Educational Research Journal, 14, 263-76.

Hall, G. E., Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M., & Hulling-Austin, L. L. (1984). Effects of three principal styles on school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41, 5, 22-29.

Hampton, D. R., Sumner, C. E., & Webber, R. A. (1978). Organizational behavior and the practice of management. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co.

Huberman, J. & Miles, M. B. (1984). Innovation up close. New York: Plenum.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools. New York: Basic Books.

Kerr, S. & Jermier, J. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22, 3, 375-403.

Keys, C. & Bartunek, J. (1979). Organization development in schools: Goal agreement process skills and diffusion of change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 15, 61-78.

Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. Teachers College Record, 91, 4, 509-536.

Little, J. W. (1988). Assessing the prospects for teacher leadership. In A. Lieberman (Ed.) Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 82, 3, 325-340.

Louis, K. S. & Miles, M. B. (1990). Improving the urban high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

Madaus, G. F. (1988). The influence of testing on the curriculum. In A. N. Tanner (Ed.), Critical issues in curriculum: 87th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University Press.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. Administrative Science Quarterly. 30:78-102.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. Harper & Row.

Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Pitner, N. J. (1986). Substitutes for principal leadership behavior: An exploratory study. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21, 23-42.

Prestine, N. A. & Bowen, C. (1993). Benchmarks of change: Assessing Essential School restructuring efforts. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15, 298-319.

Purkey, S. C. & Smith, M. S. (1985). School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. Elementary School Journal, 85, 353-89.

Rollow, S. & Bryk, A. (1993). Catalyzing professional community in a school reform left behind. In Louis, K. S. & Kruse, S. D. (Eds.) Professionalism in schools: A communitarian perspective. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Rosenblum, S. & Jastrzab, J. (1980). The role of principal in change: The Teacher Corps Example. Cambridge, MA: ABT Associates.

Rosenblum, S. & Louis, K. S. (1981). Stability and change. New York: Plenum.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Schlechty, P. C. (1985). District level policies and practices. In R. M. J. Kyle (Ed.), Reaching for excellence: An effective schools sourcebook (pp. 117-130). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Schmuck, R., Runkel, P., Arends, J. M., & Arends, R. I. (1977). The second handbook of organizational development in schools. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in administration. New York: Harper & Row.

Sieber, S. (1981). Knowledge utilization in public education: Incentives and disincentives. In R. Lehming & M. Kane (Eds.) Improving schools: Using what we know. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Smylie, M. A. & Denny, J. W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26, 34, 235-259.

van der Vegt, R. & Knip, H. (1988). The role of the principal in school improvement: Steering functions for implementation at the school level. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 22, 60-68.

Weiss, C. H. (1993). Decision making and teachers' roles in school reform. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Atlanta.

Yin, R. K., Quick, S., Bateman, P. & Marks, G. (1978). Changing urban bureaucracies: How new practices become routinized, executive summary. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Table 1
School Sample

	Classification	Grades	District	Years with SPS	Enrollment 91-92	DFG*	Percent white	Students on Free & Reduced Lunch
Full Institutionalization								
Adams School	Full	K-5	1	6	363	G	81.3%	11.8%
Baker School	Full	K-6	2	9	270	J	79.6%	1.1%
Collins School	Full	K-4	3	4	456	A	4.8%	90.4%
Davis School	Full	K-6	2	9	298	J	89.3%	3.0%
Token Institutionalization								
Edwards School	Partial	K-5	1	6	379	G	74.4%	11.9%
Forbes School	Partial	K-5	4	6	265	F	85.3%	7.9%
Grant School	Partial	K-5	1	6	374	G	80.7%	9.6%
Mixed Institutionalization								
Hollis School	Partial	K-5	4	6	373	F	90.1%	14.2%

*The district factor group (DFG) codes were developed by the state to measure wealth and other socio-economic characteristics. There are codes running from A - Very poor, inner city areas to J - Very Rich suburbs.

Table 2
Summary of the Findings of the Interviews Regarding the Presence of Leadership Functions

	Vision		Resources	Encour-agement	Standard-ization	Monitoring	Handling Disturbances
	Initial	Sustained					
Full Institutionalization							
Adams School	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Baker School	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Collins School	+	+	+	+	Ø	+	+
Davis School	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Token Institutionalization							
Edwards School	+	Ø	+	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Forbes School	+	Ø	+	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Grant School	+	Ø	+	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Mixed Institutionalization							
Hollis School	p+	p+	p+	p+	p+	p+	p+

+ = present, Ø = absent, p+ = partial fulfillment with/among a subset of teachers

Table 3
Roles that Fulfilled Functions in Fully Institutionalized Schools

	Vision						
	Initial	Sustained	Resources	Encouragement	Standardization	Monitoring	Handling Disturbances
Adams							
Central Admin.	+	Ø	+	Ø	+	Ø	Ø
Principal	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Teachers	+	+	Ø	+	+	+	+
External Agent	+	Ø	Ø	+	Ø	+	+
Baker School							
Central Admin.	+	+	+	+	+	Ø	Ø
Principal	+	+	+	+	+	+	Ø
Teachers	+	+	Ø	+	+	+	+
External Agent	+	Ø	Ø	+	Ø	+	+
Collins School							
Central Admin.	+	+	+	+	Ø	Ø	Ø
Principal	+	+	+	+	Ø	+	+
Teachers	+	+	Ø	+	Ø	+	+
External Agent	+	Ø	Ø	+	Ø	+	+
Davis School							
Central Admin.	+	+	+	+	+	Ø	Ø
Principal	Ø	Ø	+	+	+	+	Ø
Teachers	+	+	Ø	+	Ø	+	+
External Agent	+	Ø	Ø	+	Ø	+	+

+ = presence, Ø = absence